

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

Roseanne Massingille,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No.:1:13-cv-143
)	
MiraMed Revenue Group, LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

**COMPLAINT SEEKING DAMAGES FOR VIOLATION OF
THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT**

Introduction

1. This is an action for actual and statutory damages, legal fees and costs pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et. seq (hereinafter referred to as the “FDCPA”), which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive, and unfair practices. Id.
2. The purpose of the FDCPA is to eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses. Id.
3. If a violation occurs, “the FDCPA is a strict liability statute that makes debt collectors liable for violations that are not knowing or intentional.” Hahn vs. Triumph Partnerships, LLC, 557 F.3d 755, 758 (7th Cir. 2009).
4. Even a single violation of the FDCPA is sufficient to support liability. Taylor vs. Perrin, Landry, deLaundry, deLauneay, & Durand, 103 F.3d 1232, 1238 (5th Cir. 1997).

Jurisdiction

5. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d).

Venue

6. Venue is proper in this Judicial District

7. The acts and transactions alleged herein occurred in this Judicial District.
8. The Plaintiff resides in this Judicial District.
9. The Defendant transacts business in this Judicial District.

Parties

10. The Plaintiff, Roseanne Massingille, is a natural person.
11. The Plaintiff is a “consumer” as that term is defined by § 1692a.
12. The Plaintiff is “any person” as that term is used in 15 U.S.C. § 1692d preface.
13. The Defendant, MiraMed Revenue Group, LLC, (hereinafter referred to as “Defendant”), is a debt collection agency and/or debt purchaser operating from an address at 991 Oak Creek Drive, Lombard, IL 60148.
14. The Defendant is a debt collection agency and the Defendant is licensed by the State of Indiana. *See Exhibit “1” attached hereto.*
15. Defendant regularly attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another.
16. The Defendant regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another that arose out of transactions in which the money, property or services which are the subject of the transactions are primarily for personal, family or household purposes.

Factual Allegations

17. The Defendant is a debt collection agency attempting to collect a debt from Plaintiff.
18. The Plaintiff incurred a debt to that was for primarily for personal, family or household purposes as defined by §1692(a)(5).
19. The debt owed by Plaintiff went into default.
20. After the debt went into default the debt was placed or otherwise transferred to the Defendant for collection.
21. The Plaintiff disputes the debt.
22. The Plaintiff requests that the Defendant cease all further communication on the debt.
23. The Defendant’s collector(s) were employee(s) and/or representative(s) of the Defendant at all times mentioned herein.

24. The Defendant acted at all times mentioned herein through its employee(s) and/or representative(s).
25. The Plaintiff retained John Steinkamp & Associates for legal representation regarding the Plaintiff's debts.
26. On April 11, 2012, the Plaintiff's legal counsel sent a letter to the Defendant via facsimile. This letter indicated that the Plaintiff is represented by said legal counsel in addition to providing said counsel's contact information. This facsimile transmission to the Defendant was successfully received by the Defendant. *See Exhibit "2" attached hereto.*
27. Communications sent via facsimile are assumed to have been received by the intended recipient if the facsimile confirmation indicates a successful transmission. *See Laouini v. CLM Freight Lines, Inc.*, 586 F.3d 473 (7th Cir., 2009)(holding that facsimile confirmation generated by the...fax machine was sufficient to create a factual dispute that ...was received...); *Bridgeview Health Care Center Ltd. v. Clark*, 2011 WL 4585028, 3 (N.D.Ill 2011)("Indeed, in the facsimile transmission context, it is commonly understood that 'success' means that 'the two fax machines have performed an electronic "handshake" and that the data has been transmitted from one machine to the other.").
28. Despite notice of legal representation, the Defendant contacted the Plaintiff directly by phone at least 14 times from August 28, 2012, to September 28, 2012. *See Exhibit "3" attached hereto.*
29. On September 28, 2012, the Defendant contacted the Plaintiff directly by phone in an attempt to collect a debt. *See Exhibit "3" attached hereto.*
30. During this telephone conversation, the Plaintiff once again provided the Defendant with her legal counsel's information. *See Exhibit "3" attached hereto.*
31. The Defendant responded by stating that she already had that information and repeated it to the Plaintiff. *See Exhibit "3" attached hereto.*
32. During this conversation the Defendant informed the Plaintiff that she would continue to receive calls in attempts to collect a debt despite knowledge of legal representation. *See Exhibit "3" attached hereto*
33. The Defendant's collection communications are to be interpreted under the "unsophisticated consumer" standard. *See Gammon vs. GC Services, Ltd. Partnership*, 27 F.3d 1254, 1257 (7th Cir. 1994).

**First Claim for Relief:
Violation of the FDCPA**

1. The allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 33 of the complaint are realleged and incorporated herewith by references.
2. The Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c by continuing to contact the Plaintiff directly in an attempt to collect a debt despite notice of legal representation.
3. The Defendant's acts and omissions intended to harass the Plaintiff in violation of the FDCPA pursuant to the preface of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d by continuing contact the Plaintiff directly by telephone at least 14 times in a one month period, despite notice of legal representation received directly from the Plaintiff's counsel.
4. The Defendant's acts and omissions constitute unfair and unconscionable attempts to collect a debt in violation of the FDCPA pursuant to the preface of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f by contacting the Plaintiff directly by telephone at least 14 times in a one month period, despite notice of legal representation received directly from the Plaintiff's counsel.
5. The Defendant made a misrepresentation in the connection of an attempt to collect a debt pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692e when it represented to the Plaintiff that it was able to contact her directly in an attempt to collect a debt when in fact they were prohibited from doing so due to the notice of legal representation sent to the Defendant by the Plaintiff's legal counsel.
6. As a result of the above violations of the FDCPA, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for actual damages, statutory damages of \$1,000 per defendant, attorney fees, and costs.

Prayer for Relief

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that the Court grant the following:

1. A finding that the Defendant violated the FDCPA and/or an admission from the Defendant that it violated the FDCPA.
2. Actual damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1).
3. Statutory damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A).
4. Reasonable attorneys fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3).
5. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John T. Steinkamp

John T. Steinkamp
John Steinkamp and Associates
Attorney for Plaintiff
5218 S. East Street, Suite E1
Indianapolis, IN 46227
Office: (317) 780-8300
Fax: (317) 217-1320
Email: steinkamlaw@yahoo.com